

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

DARIOUS SHAMONE JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-C-1896

ROBERT MARTINEZ, II,

Defendant.

ORDER

Plaintiff Darius Shamone Jones, who is representing himself, is proceeding with a claim that the defendant improperly searched him in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Dkt. No. 8 at 4. On October 20, 2020, the Court denied Jones' motion to appoint counsel because the case was not too complex for him to handle. Dkt. No. 24. The Court noted that this case only involved one incident that occurred over a short time period and involved a limited number of witnesses. *Id.* The Court acknowledged that Jones believed discovery had become too difficult for him to handle, but it explained that Jones had to identify what aspects of discovery stymied him before the Court would consider recruiting counsel on that basis. *Id.* Discovery closed February 1, 2021; and dispositive motions are due March 19, 2021. Dkt. Nos. 27 and 29.

On March 15, 2021, Jones filed a motion for reconsideration for recruitment of counsel. Dkt. No. 30. He asks the Court to reconsider recruiting counsel "based on the sole purpose of the defendant failing to respond to discovery in a timely fashion." *Id.* The Court will deny the motion. Discovery closed over a month ago and the Court will not reopen it at this time. Having an attorney will not change the outcome of this matter. If Jones had discovery-related issues, he should have filed a motion to compel (or alternatively this motion to reconsider) before discovery closed. The scheduling order

specifically explained that the parties had to file discovery requests and resolve other discovery related matters by a date sufficiently early so that all discovery is completed by the deadline. *See* Dkt. No. 21. Further, Jones still has not explained what the discovery-related issue is. His assertion that the defendant “failed to respond in a timely fashion” is vague and does not give the Court any real information on what the parties are disputing, i.e., whether they are disputing the scope of discovery, what was produced, the manner in which questions were answered, etc. The Court will deny the motion for reconsideration for recruitment of counsel.

IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration for recruitment of counsel (Dkt. No. 30) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 18th day of March, 2021.

s/ William C. Griesbach

William C. Griesbach
United States District Judge